## GREENBELT COMMISSION MINUTES OF June 20, 2011

The Greenbelt Commission of the City of Norman, Cleveland County, State of Oklahoma, met for the Regular Meeting on June 20, 2011, at 6:30 p.m. Notice and Agenda of the meeting were posted at 201 W Gray Building A, the Norman Municipal Building and at <a href="https://www.normanok.gov">www.normanok.gov</a> twenty-four hours prior to the beginning of the meeting.

ITEM NO. 1 BEING: CALL TO ORDER.

Chairperson Lyntha Wesner called the meeting to order at 6:32 p.m.

 $\approx$   $\approx$   $\approx$   $\approx$ 

ITEM NO. 2 BEING: ROLL CALL.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Bob Bruce

Van Cline Jack Eure\* Jane Ingels

Jim McCampbell Richard McKown

Mary Peters Lyntha Wesner

ABSENT:

**Geoff Canty** 

\*J Eure arrived at 6:40.

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Susan Connors, Director of Planning & Community

Development

Jane Hudson, Planner II

Jolana McCart, Admin Tech IV

 $\approx$   $\approx$   $\approx$   $\approx$ 

ITEM NO. 3 BEING: Approval of the Minutes from the May 16, 2011 Regular Meeting.

Motion by B Bruce for approval; Second by J McCampbell. All approve.

 $\approx$   $\approx$   $\approx$   $\approx$ 

ITEM NO. 4 BEING: Review of Greenbelt Enhancement Statement Applications:

No items were submitted

 $\approx$   $\approx$   $\approx$   $\approx$ 

ITEM NO. 5 BEING: Review draft of Greenway Master Plan.

S Connors asked if there were any objections to the new 8  $\frac{1}{2}$  x 11 format. The appendices are to be downsized also if at all possible. General consensus was positive.

Chair L Wesner asked what criteria was used in changing the subject order of the document. J Hudson said that at the request of the subcommittee only a few changes had been made, such as grouping common topics together. The topics are listed from the most urban to the least urban.

Chair Wesner asked why the reference to the Canadian River had been removed from the key destinations listing. S Connors explained that there wasn't a specific destination point and thus might be misleading.

A discussion was held on the public versus private rights to the Canadian River. S Connors said that the River could be added back to the destinations list, but with a clear statement that the City would not be taking property for a trail. The River would only be listed as an appropriate place for a trail location. Chair Wesner suggested that the Canadian River be listed as a separate, independent wish list where it could be clearly stated as S Connors had suggested.

B Bruce mentioned the different methods of possible land acquisition. R McKown brought up that there was not anything in the plan about how acquisition would take place. Chair Wesner pointed out that funding sources are shown on page 41. S Connors stated that she felt that recommending several possible funding sources and options would make adoption of the plan easier. She indicated that there is no money available to begin this process at this time.

After discussion on how to state the position on purchasing property and funding to do so, Chair Wesner suggested the following change to page 41, paragraph 6 ".......This

amount could support a \$10,000,000 bond fund to accelerate <u>the purchase of land</u> and right- of- way and the development of trails.

Another change is to be made to paragraph 4, "Construction of major corridors <u>and</u> <u>acquisition of land and easements</u> should be the focus of public expenditures."

Going back to the beginning of the document, S Connors stated that the section on public input would be included in the appendices. Addressing the reorganization, she stated that the concepts, vision, and the ideas that would allow the City to create a greenbelt system had been put into the document.

S Connors stated that the City history section had been reduced and the population stats had been updated to reflect the current numbers.

Chair Wesner stated that the order of magnitude cost projections no longer appeared in the methodology listing. J Hudson said that they were now part of Appendix E. S Connors stated that since costs would change, only quantities would be listed.

The introduction had been condensed and serves as an executive summary. S Connors said that as discussed previously in this meeting, the Canadian River would be addressed separately in the destination section.

Chair Wesner stated that the subcommittee had mentioned low water crossings. She could not find anything addressing this. R McKown pointed out page 29, Bridges. J Ingels thought that page 31, addressing trail materials, also addressed low water crossing.

Per page 31, S Connors said that the term "12 feet wide" could be added to the title to read, "Corridor Trail – Concrete 10 to 12 Feet Wide."

Chair Wesner asked if different surfaces needed to be discussed and how different surfaces would change the cost. J Hudson stated that costs were not included and that cost was explained in the first paragraph of page 31. S Connors said that they were not trying to detail every surface possible. Chair Wesner asked if staff felt that people would know the surface options. S Connors stated that a list could be created listing the most used materials.

Chair Wesner asked what should happen next. S Connors stated that if the Commission was comfortable with the document, staff would make the suggested changes and put together the appendices to complete the document. She said the document would not be put on the website until completed.

## Jane Hudson

Robert Bruce [rbruce24@cox.net] From:

Tuesday, June 21, 2011 10:02 PM Sent:

Susan Connors; Jane Hudson To:

Lyntha Wesner; gjingels@sbcglobal.net Cc:

Subject: Recommended Changed to Page 7

Ms. Connors and Ms. Hudson,

Per your request (Green Belt Commission Meeting, 20 Jun), below is my recommended change/addition (softening the word picture) to Norman's Greenway Master Plan (Page 7). Change/addition is in highlighted in yellow:

Over the next few decades, the population is expected to continually increase, and by the year 2030 be near a population of 120,000 residents. The city has significant room to grow towards the eastern half of the city. However, the eastern half of the city is also the location of both the surface water and water wells supplying the entire City of Norman water supply. This is a major area of importance for water quality concerns.

## To:

Over the next few decades, the population is expected to continually increase, and by the year 2030 be near a population of 120,000 residents. The city has significant room to grow towards the eastern half of the city, which presents many development and recreational opportunities as well the challenges associated with the goal of enhancing Norman's quality and supply of water. Both the surface water and water wells supplying the City of Norman are located in the eastern area.

Appreciate your consideration regarding the change.

Vr Bob Chair Wesner suggested that the maps be more conceptual than defined. S Connors said that staff would have to find a way to change the size of the maps to 8 ½ x 11. She stated that the appendices would need to be the same size as the document. She said that City Council would be given the option to approve the Plan without the appendices. Chair Wesner asked that if staff worked with the consultants, would they be able assist with the layout changes. S Connors said that there was no money to pay the consultants for additional work but that staff did have access to the information on disk. S Connors said another possible solution would be to make the maps a separate document and keep it in the larger size. She would be speaking with GIS.

B Bruce asked if the statement "The city has significant room to grow towards the eastern half of the city" found in the second paragraph of page 7 was an original statement in the Plan. He felt that the eastern part of the city was a "hot button". S Connors stated that the Comp Plan puts strong limitations on lot size. The eastern area would not be high intensity development. V Cline asked if the statement needed to be in the document at all. B Bruce felt the statement needed to be softened. Mr. Bruce will e-mail to staff wording he felt would be more appropriate. (Please see attached e-mail.)

Chair Wesner asked if there would be another subcommittee meeting before the July meeting. S Connors said she would contact J Ingels when the document was ready. She was unsure of time that would be required to finish it, but is hoping a mock up would be ready by July.